

-----Original Message-----

From: Nelson, Jeff
Sent: Tuesday, January 29, 2013 3:11 PM
To: Randall.Dong; Hudson, Shannon; Terreni, Charles L.A.; Elliott Scott; Hoefer M. S. John
Cc: PSC_Attorneys; PSC_Technical Advisory
Subject: RE: 2012-177-WS Rate Case Expenses

Randall,

After further discussion with the Company and review and contingent upon the Company's agreement, ORS would not object to the inclusion of \$71,382.51 in additional rate case expenses in the above referenced docket.

ORS does not propose or recommend that the Commission accept any additional rate case expenses in this matter and stands by its proposed order, but believes that any additional rate case expenses approved by the Commission should be limited to no more than \$71,382.51. As stated in my previous correspondence, should the Commission require additional information or documentation regarding the inclusion of additional rate case expenses, such information should only be presented to the Commission through an evidentiary hearing.

Jeffrey M. Nelson, Esq.
S.C. Office of Regulatory Staff
1401 Main Street, Suite 900
Columbia, SC 29201
(803) 737-0823

The information transmitted is intended only for the person or entity to which it is addressed and may contain confidential, proprietary, and/or privileged material. Any review, transmission, dissemination or other use of, or taking any action in reliance upon this information, by persons or entities other than the intended recipient is prohibited. If you received this in error, please contact the sender and delete the material from all computers.

-----Original Message-----

From: Randall.Dong
Sent: Tuesday, January 29, 2013 10:01 AM
To: Nelson, Jeff; Hudson, Shannon; Terreni, Charles L.A.; Elliott Scott; Hoefer M. S. John
Cc: PSC_Attorneys; PSC_Technical Advisory
Subject: 2012-177-WS Rate Case Expenses

Dear Counsel:

We have received and reviewed Mr. Nelson's letter recapping ORS's review of the Company's rate case expenses. However, these numbers need more elaboration if we are to use them in any meaningful way. Furthermore, I would think that the Company would need more detail to have a meaningful opportunity to respond. We also need to know whether these additional data would result in any changes to the tariffs proposed by the parties in their proposed orders.

Obviously, time is of the essence.

RECEIVED

JAN 31 2013

PSC SC
MAIL / DMS

Thanks for your cooperation.

Randall Dong
Hearing Officer